

**REMARKS**

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-12 and 14-22 are currently pending in the subject application.

Applicants request, in the next Office action, that the Examiner indicate the acceptability of the drawings filed on December 31, 2003.

By this amendment, claims 2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 2, 14, 15, 18, 19 and 20 are amended, claims 6, 7, 16 and 17 are cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein, and claims 23-26 are added. No new matter is added. Support for the amendments may be at least found in FIGS. 4 and 5 and paragraphs [0034] and [0040] to [0042] of applicants' originally filed specification.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-12, 14, 15 and 18-26 are presented to the Examiner for further prosecution on the merits. Claims 1 and 11 are independent.

**A. Introduction**

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4, 11-12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/00993 to Chen et al. ("the Chen et al. reference"); rejected claims 5 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chen et al. reference as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 11-12 and 14, and further in view of allegedly admitted prior art ("AAPA"); and rejected claims 6-10 and 16-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chen et al. reference as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 11-12 and 14, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,560,776 to Sugai et al. ("the Sugai et al. reference") and U.S. Patent No. 5,531,834 to Ishizuka et al. ("the Ishizuka et al. reference").

B. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4, 11-12 and 14

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4, 11-12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chen et al. reference. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

In the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3 of the Office action, the Examiner states that Chen et al. reference discloses a coil including an outermost coil and a plurality of inner turns, wherein the outermost turn is connected in parallel with the plurality of inner turns. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully note that each of independent claims 1 and 11 recites “the outermost coil is connected in parallel with the plurality of inner turns.” That is, claims 1 and 11 clearly recite a coil having a parallel relationship between an outermost turn of the coil and the plurality of inner turns of the coil. Applicants respectfully submit that none of the embodiments of the Chen et al. reference disclose such features. Applicants respectfully note that each of the terms, e.g., “turns,” “coil,” “outermost,” and “parallel”, of claims 1 and 11 should be considered. For example, applicants note that the relationship between “turns” and “coil” should be considered, i.e., a coil includes turns, and the terms should not be randomly interchanged. In particular, while the Chen et al. reference may be directed to “two single-turn coils” as shown in FIG. 3 and “multiple coil, multiple turn systems” as shown in FIGS. 4-7 and broadly stated on page 7, lines 23-26 thereof, the Chen et al. reference fails to suggest let alone disclose a parallel relationship between an outermost turn and a plurality of inner turns of a coil.

For at least these reasons, the Chen et al. reference does not suggest, let alone disclose, all the features of independent claims 1 and 11 including, *inter alia*:

a coil having a plurality of turns including an outermost turn and a plurality of inner turns, wherein the outermost turn is connected in parallel with the plurality of inner turns.

For at least these reasons, applicants submit that the Chen et al. reference fails to disclose and suggest all the features of independent claims 1 and 11, as well as all the features of dependent claims 2, 4, 12 and 14, which directly or indirectly depend from one of claims 1 and 11. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

C. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claims 5 and 15

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 5 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chen et al. reference as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 11-12 and 14, and further in view of the AAPA of an antenna with a plurality of turns that is formed of a single conductive line. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claims 5 and 15 respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 11. Applicants respectfully submit that the AAPA fails to overcome the deficiencies of the Chen et al. reference discussed above with regard to independent claims 1 and 11. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claims 5 and 15 are allowable over the combination of the Chen et al. reference and the AAPA for at least the reasons that independent claims 1 and 11 are allowable. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

D. Asserted Obviousness Rejection of Claims 6-10 and 16-22

In the outstanding Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 6-10 and 16-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chen et al. reference as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 11-12 and 14, and further in view of the Sugai et al. reference and the Ishizuka et al. reference. This rejection is rendered moot in view of the cancellation of independent claims 6 and 16, the cancellation of dependent claims 7 and 17 and the amendment to dependent claims 8-10 and 18-

22 to depend directly or indirectly from one of independent claims 1 and 11. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

E. Amended Dependent Claims 8-10 and 18-20 and New Claims 22-26

Claims 8-10 and 18-20 now directly or indirectly depend from one of independent claims 1 and 11, and thus, are allowable over the applied references for at least the reasons that claims 1 and 11 are allowable. New claims 22-26 also directly or indirectly depend form one of independent claims 1 and 11 and thus, are allowable over the applied references for at least the reasons that claims 1 and 11 are allowable.

F. Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below to expedite resolution of any outstanding issues.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this application is earnestly solicited, and an early and favorable further action upon all the claims is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE & MORSE, P.C.

Date: April 30, 2007

  
Eugene M. Lee, Reg. No. 32,039

**LEE & MORSE, P.C.**  
3141 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE, SUITE 500  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042  
703.207.0008 TEL  
703.207.0003 FAX

PETITION and  
DEPOSIT ACCOUNT CHARGE AUTHORIZATION

This document and any concurrently filed papers are believed to be timely. Should any extension of the term be required, applicant hereby petitions the Director for such extension and requests that any applicable petition fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

If fee payment is enclosed, this amount is believed to be correct. However, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.

Any additional fee(s) necessary to effect the proper and timely filing of the accompanying-papers may also be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1645.